REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8 and 11 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4 and 8 are amended. Support for these amendments can be found, at least, in paragraphs [0053] - [0060] and Fig. 4 of the instant specification. No new matter is added.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,985,332 to Sluzewski et al. ("Sluzewski") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0099054 to Kamijima and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,135 to Rancour et al. ("Rancour"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 1, 4, and 8 are amended to recite a geometric pathway for the electrical connection of the second pole to the arm. Specifically, claims 1, 4, and 8, as amended, now substantially recite the second pole being "electrically connected to the arm by entering the conductible support through the second surface of the magnetic head part and exiting the conductible support through a surface in direct contact with the arm." Neither Sluzewski, nor Kamijima, nor Rancour disclose or suggest the features of claims 1, 4 and 8.

For example, using the rejection of claim 1 for illustrative purposes, the Office Action asserts that Sluzewski discloses a bond pad 148b that the Office Action alleges is equivalent to the recited "second pole." See col. 7, lines 53-66, and Fig. 5 of Sluzewski. However, as can be seen in Fig. 3 of Sluzewski, bond pads 148 (allegedly containing the recited "second pole") do not directly make contact with, pass through, or exit the suspension 124 (allegedly equivalent to the recited "conductible support"), to electrically connect to the head stack assembly 108 (allegedly equivalent to the recited "arm member"). See Fig. 3 and col. 7, lines 6-52 of Sluzewski. Specifically, Sluzewski does not disclose a sequential geometric pathway connecting the bond pads 148 to the head stack assembly 108. See Fig. 3 of Sluzewski.

By contrast, claim 1, as amended, recites the second pole being "electrically connected to the arm by entering the conductible support through the second surface of the magnetic head

part and exiting the conductible support through a surface in direct contact with the arm." Sluzewski does not disclose this feature of claim 1, nor does it disclose the similar features of claims 4 and 8.

Additionally, Rancour allegedly discloses a magnetic head 126 having a first side surface on the left side of the magnetic head and a second surface on the right side of the magnetic head. The Office Action asserts magnetic head 126 and the first side surface on the left side of the magnetic head and the second surface on the right side of the magnetic head are equivalent to the recited "head slider" and respective "first" and "second surface[s] of the head slider." See Figs. 2 and 5 and col. 2, lines 47-65, and col. 4, lines 21-45 of Rancour. Rancour also discloses bond pads 140 which are connected to a suspension gimbal 124 (allegedly equivalent to the recited "conductible support"). See Fig. 5 and col. 2, lines 59-65, and col. 3, lines 58-65 of Rancour. However, the bond pads 140 make electrical contact through a ball 142 in order to create electrical contact between the magnetic head 126 and the suspension gimbal 124. See col. 3, lines 33-43 of Rancour. Therefore, the bond pads are electrically connected through the ball 142 and do not provide a direct electrical connection between the magnetic head 126 and the suspension gimbal 124. See Figs. 3 and 4 and col. 3, lines 33-57 of Rancour. As such, Rancour does not disclose a sequential geometric pathway connecting the bond pads 140 with the suspension gimbal 124. See Figs. 3-5 of Rancour.

By contrast, claim 1 as amended now recites the second pole being "electrically connected to the arm by entering the conductible support through the second surface of the magnetic head part and exiting the conductible support through a surface in direct contact with the arm." Neither Rancour, nor Sluzewski, nor Kamijima discloses or suggests this feature of claim 1, nor do they disclose or suggest the similar features of claims 4 and 8. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4 and 8 and claims 3, 7 and 11 depending therefrom.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 8 and 11 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Stephen J. Pachol
Registration No. 62,487

JAO:SJP/eks

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: January 15, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461